



CLERK, U.S. BANKRUPTCY COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

ENTERED

**THE DATE OF ENTRY IS ON
THE COURT'S DOCKET**

The following constitutes the ruling of the court and has the force and effect therein described.

Signed August 2, 2024


United States Bankruptcy Judge

**IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION**

IN RE: § CASE NO. 22-30500-swe7
DENNIS JAMES ROGERS II, §
Debtor. § CHAPTER 7

**AREYA HOLDER AURZADA,
CHAPTER 7 TRUSTEE FOR THE
BANKRUPTCY ESTATE OF
DENNIS JAMES ROGERS II
Plaintiff,**

v. **§ Adversary No. 24-03028**
§
FUNDERZ.NET, LLC, **§**
§
§
§
§
Defendant.

ORDER

Before the Court is Defendant’s Motion to Dismiss Trustee’s Complaint (the “Motion to Dismiss”) filed by Defendant Funderz.Net, LLC (“Defendant”). (Dkt. No. 5). Since the filing of the Motion to Dismiss, Plaintiff has filed an Amended Complaint (Dkt. No. 20) and a Notice of

Mootness regarding the Motion to Dismiss (Dkt. No. 21).

It is well established that a later-filed amended complaint moots a motion asking the Court to dismiss an earlier-filed complaint. *See Griffin v. Am. Zurich Ins. Co.*, 697 F. App'x 793, 797 (5th Cir. 2017) (“Once filed, that amended complaint rendered all earlier motions ... moot.”); see also *Bishop Display Tech LLC v. Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd.*, No. 2:21-cv-00139-JRG, Dkt. No. 40 (E.D. Tex. Oct. 4, 2021) (“Once Plaintiff filed its amended complaint, the Motion became moot.”); *Ultravision Technologies, LLC v. Eaton Corp. PLC*, No. 2:19-CV-00290-JRG, 2019 WL 11250161, at *1 (E.D. Tex. Nov. 7, 2019) (“Accordingly, the filing of an amended complaint moots a motion to dismiss the original complaint.”).

Accordingly, the Court finds that the Motion to Dismiss (Dkt. No. 5) should be and hereby is **DENIED-AS-MOOT**.

END OF ORDER